

an universal respect; for we had no man
among us whom
all sides loved and honoured so much as they
did him.¹

Under this peer of immense
respectability but little
practical ability, the administration of the
navy does not
seem to have been any better than it was
when Torrington
was First Lord. In March 1692, Pembroke
was replaced
by Lord Cornwallis, and on his death in April
1693, he was
succeeded by Anthony, Viscount Falkland.
He had been
treasurer of the navy in 1681 and one of the
Admiralty
commissioners since January 1691, so that
he had some
experience of naval administration. In
December 1693
the House of Commons charged him with
peculation, for
which he was censured and lost his place.²
On May 2,
1694, Edward Russell (created in 1697
Earl of Orford)
became First Lord and held the post
till June 1699.
According to Macaulay, 'from the time he
became first
lord of the admiralty there was a decided
improvement in
the naval administration/ The men who
served under
him ' had better food and drink than they
ever had before/
But in another passage, when speaking of the
causes which
led to Russell's retirement from office in
1699, Macaulay
comes to the conclusion that while Russell may
have spent
the public money better than his
predecessors, he em-
bezzled a great deal of it.³ These charges
of embezzle-

ment may or may not be true ; but they prove conclusively that the finances of the navy were very badly managed. Torrington was probably not far wrong when he described the commissioners of the admiralty as a set of ' insipid ignorants '.⁴ It was true of most of them, but perhaps

¹ Burnet, ii. 199.

-Grey, Debates, x. 348-56.

^y V, 2454 (xx) ; VI, 2887-8 (xxiv).

*Epistolary Curiosities, ed. Rebecca Warner, 1st Ser. (1818), p. 157.